

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 8-42 are now pending in the application. New Claims 40-42 have been added. The amendments to the claims contained herein are of equivalent scope as originally filed and, thus, are not a narrowing amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 6, 9-13, 15, 16, 18-26, 28, 29, 31-34, and 36-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by March (U.S. Pat. No. 6,490,506). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended Claims 1, 10, 20, and 31. The amended claims now recite that the power supply generates a power signal for operating a plasma chamber. March does not anticipate operating a plasma chamber.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1, 10, 20, and 31 define over the art cited by the Examiner. Likewise, claims 2, 3, 6, 9, 11-13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21-26, 28, 29, 32-34, and 36-39, which depend from claims 1, 10, 20, and 31, also define over the art cited by the Examiner. Applicant has added new independent Claims 40 and 42 containing limitations similar to those added to Claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 40 and 42, as well as the corresponding dependent Claim 41, are now in condition of allowance.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5, 8, 14, 17, 27, 30, and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over March (U.S. Pat. No. 6,490,506) in view of Snow et. al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,734,575). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the arguments made above with respect to March apply equally hereto. Applicant further respectfully submits that, at the time the invention was made, it would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a neural network and an expert system together with a method for determining maintenance costs of a hydroelectric power generation facility to arrive at the solution of monitoring a power delivery system used for operating a plasma chamber.

MPEP § 2141.01(a) states that "the reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned." *In re Otiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1446 (Fed. Cir. 1992). March at best discloses a system for monitoring maintenance information in a hydroelectric power generation facility. The present invention pertains to a power supply which generates a power signal for operating a plasma chamber. Applicant respectfully asserts that when designing a power supply for a plasma chamber, there is no colorable argument that a hydroelectric power plant "logically would have commended itself to an inventor's attention in considering his problem." *In re Clay*, 966 F.2d 656, 659 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The only logical relation is that a hydroelectric power plant generates grid electricity that a power supply might receive its input power from. This is the same grid electricity that a garage door opener or lamp would use, inventive

areas that are obviously not analogous to a hydroelectric plant. Even similar electrical systems that have different intended applications have been held to be non-analogous. *See, e.g., Wang Laboratories, Inc. v. Toshiba Corp.*, 993 F.2d 858 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (Single Inline Memory Module (SIMM) for use in an industrial controller was not an analogous reference for a SIMM intended for use in a personal computer).

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5, 8, 14, 17, 27, 30, and 35 define over the art cited by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Aug 18, 2004

By: 

Joseph M. Lafata, Reg. No. 37,166

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/elh